

Amendments to the Drawings:

The drawing sheet attached in connection with the above-identified application containing Figures 1A and 1B is being presented as a new formal drawing sheet to be substituted for the previously submitted drawing sheet. Figure 1A has been amended. Appended to this amendment is an annotated copy of the previous drawing sheet which has been marked to show the changes presented in the replacement sheet.

The specific changes which have been made to Figure 1A are the additions of the reference character "O" and its corresponding leader line.

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow. After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1 and 28-47 are now pending in this application.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given to the claims.

Information disclosure statement

Applicants respectfully requested consideration of information disclosure statement (IDS) filed on July 8, 2010, and a copy of a fully initialed and signed PTO/SB/08 form accompany the next office communication.

Drawings

An objection has been raised with respect to the drawings because the reference character "O" and a separate connecting element as recited in claims 13 and 25 are not shown in the drawings. Fig. 1A has been amended to include the reference character "O" and its corresponding leader line. Claims 13 and 25 have been canceled. For at least these reasons, favorable reconsideration of the objection is respectfully requested.

Specification

An objection has been raised with respect to the specification because the abstract contains legal phraseology and the claim numbers in the specification should be removed. The specification has been amended to correct these minor informalities. For at least these reasons, favorable reconsideration of the objection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of claims 1-27 based on 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for allegedly being indefinite.

It is alleged that claim 1 is indefinite because of the phrase "in particular." This phrase has been deleted from claim 1.

It is alleged that claims 2-27 are indefinite because of various informalities. Claims 2-27 have been canceled, which renders the rejection of these claims moot.

For at least these reasons, favorable reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of claims 19-21 based on 35 U.S.C. 101

Claims 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101. Claims 19-21 have been canceled, which renders the rejection of these claims moot. For at least this reason, favorable reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of claims 1-12, 14-24, and 26-27 based on Roberts

Claims 1-2, 6-7, 9-12, 14-15, 18-20, 22-24, and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,942,910 (“Roberts”). Claims 16 and 21 are rejected either under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Roberts or under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Roberts. Claims 3-5, 8, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Roberts. For at least the following reasons, these rejections are traversed.

Claim 1 (as amended) recites, among other things, a hybrid component for a vehicle comprising: a plastic structure; and a metal base body having an edge region and an integrally formed fixing element on the edge region. The fixing element is configured to at least mechanically join the plastic structure to the base body. An edge of the fixing element is inserted into a recess in the plastic structure. Support for the amended portions of claim 1 may be found, for example, in Figs. 4A-4B and Figs. 5A-5B of the present application.

Roberts does not teach or suggest the combination of features of claim 1. For example, Roberts does not teach or suggest the edge of the fixing element being inserted into a recess in the plastic structure. Roberts discloses a structural member 12 having a metal substrate 22 and a blow molded member 24. The member 24 may be secured to the substrate 22 by folding a flange portion 22 of the substrate over the blow molded member 24, as seen in circle B in Fig. 3. However, the edge of the flange portion 44 (which the PTO considers to be the fixing element of claim 1) is not inserted into a recess in the blow molded member 24 (which the PTO considers to be the plastic structure of claim 1). Because Roberts does not teach or suggest this feature, claim 1 is allowable over Roberts.

Claims 2-12, 14-24, and 26-27 have been canceled, which renders the rejections of these claims moot.

For at least these reasons, favorable reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Rejection of claims 13 and 25 based on Roberts and Wagenblast

Claims 13 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Roberts and U.S. Patent No. 6,503,585 (“Wagenblast”).

Claims 13 and 25 have been canceled, which renders the rejections of these claims moot.

Also, to the extent that this rejection may be used to reject claim 1, Roberts and Wagenblast do not teach or suggest the features of claim 1. For example and as previously mentioned, Roberts does not teach or suggest an edge of a fixing element being inserted into a recess in the plastic structure. Wagenblast does not cure this deficiency. Wagenblast merely discloses a hollow-chamber component with a U-section 1, a rib structure 2, a coversheet 4, and a connector connecting the coversheet 4 and U-section 1 together. For example, the connector may be a plastic rivet joint 5 (Fig. 1), a snap element 6 (Fig. 1), a bore 14 formed from the cover sheet 4 (Fig. 4), a clinching joint 15 (Fig. 5), a clinched bore 16 (Fig. 6), or a clinched joint with a joint part 17 (Fig. 7). However, Wagenblast does not teach or suggest an edge of a fixing element being inserted into a recess in the plastic structure. Because Roberts and Wagenblast lack this feature, claim 1 is allowable over Roberts and Wagenblast.

For at least these reasons, favorable reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Allowability of claims 28-47

Claims 28-41 depend from and contain all the features of claim 1, and are allowable for the same reasons as claim 1, without regard to the further patentable features recited therein. Accordingly, claims 28-41 are allowable over Roberts and Wagenblast.

Claim 42 recites, among other things, a method comprising: providing a metal base body with an integrally formed fixing element in an edge region of the metal base body, positioning a plastic structure in a cavity in the metal base body, reshaping the integrally formed fixing element of the metal base body such that the plastic structure is connected at least mechanically in an edge region of the plastic structure to the metal base body, and inserting an edge of the fixing element into a recess in the plastic structure. Roberts and

Wagenblast do not teach or suggest this combination of features. For example and as previously mentioned, Roberts and Wagenblast do not teach or suggest an edge of a fixing element being inserted into a recess in the plastic structure. Accordingly, claim 42 is allowable over Roberts and Wagenblast.

Claims 43-44 depend from and contain all the features of claim 42, and are allowable for the same reasons as claim 42, without regard to the further patentable features recited therein. Accordingly, claims 43-44 are allowable over Roberts and Wagenblast.

Claim 45 recites, among other things, a hybrid component for a vehicle comprising: a plastic structure; and a metal base body having an edge region and an integrally formed fixing element on the edge region. The fixing element is configured to at least mechanically join the plastic structure to the base body. The integrally formed fixing element is designed as a latching element. Roberts and Wagenblast do not teach or suggest an integrally formed fixing element being designed as a latching element. Because Roberts and Wagenblast lack this feature, claim 45 is allowable over Roberts and Wagenblast.

Claims 46-47 depend from and contain all the features of claim 45, and are allowable for the same reasons as claim 45, without regard to the further patentable features recited therein. Accordingly, claims 46-47 are allowable over Roberts and Wagenblast.

For at least these reasons, allowance of claims 28-47 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by the credit card payment instructions in EFS-Web being incorrect or absent, resulting in a rejected or incorrect credit card transaction, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under

37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorize payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 7/13/2010

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 295-4618
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By Matthew J. Kremer

Matthew A. Smith
Registration No. 49,003

Matthew J. Kremer
Registration No. 58,671